UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,058	12/29/2000	Chris L. Hendriks	1662-32700(P99-2903)	9027

22879   7590   08/10/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
STRANGE, AARON N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/752,058	HENDRIKS, CHRIS L.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Aaron Strange	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 June 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-43_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-43_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _29 December 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.　　Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.　　The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.　　Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4.　　Claim 43 recites the limitation "the second remote web browser" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The Office recommends that the claim be emended to recite "the second remote browser" in line 4 or "a second remote web browser" in lines 1-2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.　　The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Princeton.edu.

7.   The Office would like to inform Applicant that the collection of references from http://www.princeton.edu/~csg/roaming, beginning with the document titled "Roaming with Netscape Communicator 4.5 and Above", while located in a plurality of separate files, have been treated as a single reference, and numbered by the Examiner. All of the references are parts of the same website, retrieved from the Internet Archive Wayback Machine, dating from 8/19/1999 to 11/17/1999, and relating to the same subject matter. The reference is very much like multiple chapters in a book, and have accordingly been treated a single reference in this Office action. Alternatively, a rejection under 35 USC 103(a) could be made using the combination of references. Since the pages are all part of the same website and relate to the same subject matter, the motivation to combine them is apparent.

8.   With regard to claim 1, Princeton.edu (Princeton, hereafter) discloses a method of remotely managing navigation data on the Internet, comprising: accessing a remote nav server (roaming access server); and redirecting to the remote nav server accesses and writes of navigation data attempted by the web browser (Profile is retrieved from server at startup, and changes are redirected to the server when quitting) (Page 3, Lines 3-7).

9.   With regard to claim 2, Princeton further discloses selecting whether the data is to be managed remotely (User has the option to enable/disable roaming) (Page 4).

10.   With regard to claim 3, Princeton further discloses starting a nav module coupled

to the web browser (Start Guest Login to initiate roaming) (Pages 14-15).

11.   With regard to claim 4, Princeton further discloses that the nav module, in

conjunction with the web browser, prompts the user to select whether navigation data is

to be managed remotely (Navigation data can be selected or unselected for remote

management via checkboxes in Guest Login window) (Page 15).

12.   With regard to claim 5, Princeton further discloses that the nav module, in

conjunction with the web browser, directs the user to the nav server to log in (Page 14,

Step 2).

13.   With regard to claims 6 and 7, while Princeton fails to specifically disclose that

the nav server provides remote protocol including the address and formatting for the

navigation data to be redirected to the nav server, this limitation is inherent. Since the

navigation data is redirected to the nav server, a protocol, including addressing and

formatting information, must be provided in order for the data to be properly received by

the nav server.

14.   With regard to claim 8, Princeton further discloses that accessing a remote

server comprises logging on to the remote server as a specific user (UserID/password

combo provides unique identification) (Pages 14-15).

15.   With regard to claim 9, while Princeton fails to specifically disclose that the

navigation data is separately stored at the nav server for each user, this limitation is

inherent. Since each user has a personal profile that contains specific information such

as bookmarks, preferences, and an address book (Page 2, Lines 7-10), the navigation

data for each user must be separately stored, so each user will get only the information in their particular profile.

16.   With regard to claim 10, Princeton further discloses that the navigation data is securely stored at the nav server (UserID/password required to access navigation data) (Pages 14-15).

17.   With regard to claim 11, Princeton discloses a system for remotely managing navigation data, comprising: a remote nav server accessible via the Internet (profile server) (Page 2, Lines 8-9); and a nav module coupled to a web browser (Netscape) redirecting accesses and writes of navigation data attempted by the web browser to the remote nav server (Navigation data is downloaded from server at startup and uploaded to the server when quitting) (Page 3).

18.   With regard to claim 12, Princeton further discloses that the nav server includes memory to store the navigation data (Profiles are stored on the profile server) (Page 2, Lines 8-9).

19.   With regard to claim 13, Princeton further discloses that the nav server securely stores the navigation data (UserID/password required to access navigation data) (Pages 14-15).

20.   With regard to claim 14, Princeton further discloses that the nav server comprises an interface login protocol which requires the user to login (UserID/password required to access navigation data) (Pages 14-15).

21.   With regard to claim 15, while Princeton fails to specifically disclose that the nav server separately stores the navigation data for each user, this limitation is inherent.

Since each user has a personal profile that contains specific information such as

bookmarks, preferences, and an address book (Page 2, Lines 7-10), the navigation data

for each user must be separately stored, so each user will get only the information in

their particular profile.

22.   With regard to claim 16, Princeton further discloses an Internet service provider

(Princeton University), wherein the nav server is incorporated within the Internet service

provider (the campus has a dedicated roaming profile server, roaming.Princeton.edu)

(Page 2, Lines 8-9 and Page 5, Line 2).

23.   With regard to claim 17, Princeton further discloses that the nav module prompts

the user to select whether the data is to be managed remotely (Navigation data can be

selected or unselected for remote management via checkboxes in Guest Login window)

(Page 15).

24.   With regard to claim 18, Princeton further discloses that the nav module propts

the user to select whether navigation data is to be managed remotely each time

navigation data is to be accessed (Navigation data can be selected or unselected for

remote management via checkboxes in Guest Login window) (Page 15).

25.   With regard to claim 19, Princeton further discloses that the nav module in

conjunction with the web browser directs the user to the remote nav server (the user is

directed to the nav server by logging in) (Page 15, Line 6).

26.   With regard to claim 20, while Princeton fails to specifically disclose that the nav

module retrieves the remote protocol for redirecting the navigation data from the nav

server, this limitation is inherent. Since the navigation data is redirected to the nav

server a protocol for data transfer must be provided in order for the data to be properly received by the nav server.

27.   With regard to claim 21, Princeton further discloses that the nav module intercepts attempts to read or write navigation data and redirects those attempts to the remote nav server (Profile is retrieved from server at startup, and changes are redirected to the server when quitting) (Page 3, Lines 3-7).

28.   With regard to claim 22, while Princeton fails to specifically disclose that the nav module overlays that portion of the web browser responsible for attempts to read or write navigation data (Page 3, Lines 3-4), this limitation in inherent. Since all changes to the navigation data are send to the server when the user quits roaming, the nav module must overlay the part of the web browser responsible for attempts to read or write navigation data. The nav module must be aware of all changes to the navigation data in order to send those changes to the server.

29.   With regard to claim 23, while Princeton fails to specifically disclose that the nav module passes to the web browser a remote protocol for redirecting the navigation data to the nav server, this limitation is inherent. Since the navigation data is redirected to the nav server a protocol for data transfer must be provided in order for the data to be properly received by the nav server.

30.   With regard to claim 24, Princeton further discloses that the nav module is incorporated within the web browser (Nav module is a component of Netscape) (Pages 14-15).

31.   With regard to claim 25, Princeton discloses a method for managing navigation

data on the Internet, comprising: accessing a remote nav server (roaming access

server); and downloading navigation data from the remove nav server, wherein the

navigation data is stored locally for subsequent use by a web browser without accessing

the remote nav server (Profile is retrieved from server at startup, and changes are

redirected to the server only when quitting) (Page 3, Lines 3-7).

32.   With regard to claim 26, Princeton further discloses redirecting to the remote nav

server accesses and writes of navigation data attempted by the web browser (Changes

are sent to the nav server when quitting) (Page 3, Lines 3-7).

33.   With regard to claim 27, Princeton further discloses starting a nav module

coupled to the web browser (Start Guest Login to initiate roaming) (Pages 14-15).

34.   With regard to claim 28, Princeton further discloses that the navigation data

comprises a cookie (User can select cookies to be included in profile) (Page 15).

35.   With regard to claim 29, Princeton further discloses that the navigation data

comprises a bookmark (User can select bookmarks to be included in profile) (Page 15).

36.   With regard to claim 30, Princeton further discloses downloading data from the

remote nav server, wherein the navigation data is stored locally for subsequent use by

thr web browser without accessing the remote nav server (Profile is retrieved from

server at startup, and changes are redirected to the server only when quitting) (Page 3,

Lines 3-7).

37.   With regard to claim 31, Princeton further discloses that the navigation data

comprises a cookie (User can select cookies to be included in profile) (Page 15).

38.   With regard to claim 32, Princeton further discloses that the navigation data

comprises a bookmark (User can select bookmarks to be included in profile) (Page 15).

39.   With regard to claim 33, Princeton discloses a method for managing navigation

data on the Internet, comprising storing a cookie received from a remote web browser

(Profile containing cookies is stored) (Page 2, Lines 8-9); receiving a request from the

remote web browser for the cookie (Start up roaming and request profile) (Page 3, Lines

3-4); and sending the cookie to the remote web browser (Profile is transferred to local

computer) (Page 3, Lines 3-4).

40.   With regard to claim 34, Princeton further discloses receiving a request from a

second remote web browser for the cookie; and sending the cookie to the second

remote web browser (Roaming from two computers simultaneously is allowed) (Page 3,

Lines 6-7).

41.   With regard to claim 35, Princeton discloses a method for managing navigation

data on the Internet, comprising storing a bookmark received from a remote web

browser (Profile containing bookmarks is stored) (Page 2, Lines 8-9), wherein the

bookmark is created using a bookmark interface of the remote web browser; receiving a

request from the remote web browser for the bookmark (Start up roaming and request

profile) (Page 3, Lines 3-4); and sending the bookmark to the remote web browser

(Profile is transferred to local computer) (Page 3, Lines 3-4).

42.   With regard to claim 36, Princeton further discloses receiving a request from a

second remote web browser for the bookmark; and sending the bookmark to the second

remote web browser (Roaming from two computers simultaneously is allowed) (Page 3, Lines 6-7).

43.   With regard to claim 37, Princeton discloses a system, comprising: a storage device in which navigation data is stored (profile server) (Page 2, Lines 8-9); a network connection that sends and receives navigation data (Profile is downloaded/uploaded) (Page 3, Lines 3-4); and instructions stored in the storage device that cause the system to receive a cookie (Profiles contain cookies) (Page 6) when a remote web browser attempts to store the cookie, store the cookie in the storage device (Profile changes are stored when user quits roaming), and send the cookie to the remote web browser when the remote web browser attempts to access the cookie (Profile is downloaded when roaming is initiated) (Page 3, Lines 3-4).

44.   With regard to claim 38, Princeton further discloses the instructions further causing the system to send the cookie to a second remote web browser when the second remote web browser attempts to access the cookie (Roaming from two computers simultaneously is allowed) (Page 3, Lines 6-7).

45.   With regard to claim 39, Princeton further discloses the instructions further causing the system to store a bookmark when the bookmark is created using a bookmark interface of the remote web browser, and send the bookmark to the remote web browser when the bookmark is selected using the bookmark interface (Profiles also contain bookmarks) (Page 6).

46.   With regard to claim 40, Princeton further discloses the instructions further causing the system to receive a request from a second web browser for the bookmark,

and send the bookmark to the second remote web browser (Roaming from two

computers simultaneously is allowed) (Page 3, Lines 6-7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

47.   Claims 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Princeton in view of Anderson.

48.   With regard to claims 41-43, Princeton discloses a navigation server, comprising:

a network connection that sends a cookie to a remote web browser and a storage

device in which the cookie is stored (Profile is stored on roaming server) (Page 2, Lines

8-9). However, Princeton fails to disclose that when the remote web browser or a

second remote browser attempts to access the cookie in a local storage device on a

computer where the remote web browser is executing, the navigation server sends the

cookie to the remote web browser or second remote browser or when the remote web

browser attempts to store the cookie to the local storage, the cookie is stored in the

storage device of the navigation server.

Anderson teaches a method of accessing files on a remote server that appear to

be located locally. NFS allows the client to mount a remote directory and access it in the

same manner as a local directory. When a client attempts to access the file, the request

is redirected to the remote server and the file is sent from the server to the client (Page

1, Lines 1-6). This would be as advantageous addition to the system disclosed by

Princeton since it would allow real time updates of navigation data, allowing multiple

users to update and access the same profile simultaneously.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a file system such as NFS to allow the client to read/write cookies stored on a remote server in the same manner as cookies stored in local storage. This allows real time access to the user profiles disclosed by Princeton and would allow multiple users to update and access the same profile simultaneously.

Conclusion

49.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

50.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

51.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 703-305-

8878. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 703-305-4792. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANS 8/5/2004

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100